

REMARKS

Applicants thanks Examiners Foong and Fourson for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the August 26, 2003 personal interview. The points and agreements are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute the Applicants' record of the interview. Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 21 are amended. Claims 1, 2 and 21 are amended to recite "exfoliation" which places the claims in condition for allowance, as agreed during the August 26, personal interview. The concept of exfoliation is supported, among others, on page 11, lines 16-20 of the specification.

For the following reasons, Applicants submit that at least this application is allowable. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Satisfy All Formal Requirements

The Office Action objects to claims 8, 9 and 21 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75. Claims 8 and 9 are amended to further delineate the method of claim 1. Claim 21 is amended to positively recite "forming a plurality of thin film device layers on a flat substrate." Claims 1 and 3 do not recite this feature. Thus, claim 21 is not substantially duplicative of claim 3. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 8, 9 and 21 is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,087,585 to Hayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,499,124 to Vu et al. ("Vu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Hayashi nor Vu teach or suggest a method of forming a three-dimensional device including "irradiating the separable layer with light to cause exfoliation in the separable layer," as recited in independent claim 1, "depositing the second thin film device layer on the first thin film device layer by exfoliation in a separable layer on which the

second thin film device layer is formed," as recited in independent claim 2, or "irradiating the separable layer with light to cause exfoliation in at least one of the separable layer and at least an interference so that the second thin film device layer is transferred to the first substrate," as recited in independent claim 21.

Vu discloses that after the circuit tiles are registered and adhered to the module body 110, the transfer body 80 and the epoxy 82 are removed using a suitable etchant. After the transfer body 80 is etched off, the epoxy 82 is removed by oxygen plasma, sulfuric acid or boiling trichloroethylene. Alternatively, a removable epoxy can be used, where the module body 110 is exposed to heat, UV radiation, microwave radiation or chemicals to diminish or remove the adhesive properties of the selected adhesive 82, allowing the glass 80 to be lifted off. Thus, Vu discloses removing the transfer body 80 and the epoxy 82 by etching or weakening the bond of the adhesive 82 to allow the glass 80 to be lifted off. Vu does not disclose irradiating a separable layer with light to cause exfoliation in the separable layer as recited by the claimed invention. In addition, Hayashi does not make up for the deficiencies of Vu.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the April 24, 2002 Office Action takes Official Notice regarding certain issues. However, the official notice does not render the claims unpatentable. For example, the Office Action takes official notice that laser ablation to remove materials was known. Applicants assert, however, that knowledge of laser ablation does not teach or suggest irradiating with laser light as recited in claims 6 and 24.

MPEP §2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 21 are patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the

applied references for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

JAO:SSK/tbh

Date: September 12, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--